

**CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
COMMITTEE ON CONGESTION MANAGEMENT
AND AIR QUALITY (CMAQ)**

**MINUTES
MEETING OF January 26, 2004**

At 3:00 p.m., Chairman Marland Townsend called the meeting to order in Conference Room C of San Mateo City Hall.

Members Attending: Duane Bay, Jim Bigelow, Deborah Bringelson, Tom Davids, Sue Lempert, Arthur Lloyd, Karyl Matsumoto, Barbara Pierce, Irene O'Connell, Lennie Roberts, Toni Stein, Toni Taylor, Marland Townsend, and Onnolee Trapp.

Staff/Guests Attending: Rich Napier (C/CAG Executive Director), Walter Martone, Geoffrey Kline and Sandy Wong (C/CAG Staff - County Public Works), Pat Dixon (Transportation Authority Citizens Advisory Committee), Corrine Goodrich (SamTrans/JPB), Christine Maley-Grubl (Peninsula Congestion Relief Alliance), Jim Kelley, Pam Rianda.

1. Public comment on items not on the agenda.

- Chair Townsend welcome and introduced two new CMAQ members, Member Taylor and Member Pierce.
- Member Matsumoto asked for the attendance report.

CONSENT AGENDA

2. Minutes of December 15, 2003 meeting.

Motion: To approve the Minutes as presented. Bigelow/Lempert, all in favor, Taylor and Pierce abstained.

REGULAR AGENDA

3. Caltrain Strategic Plan (Draft plan presentation).

Corrine Goodrich of SamTrans/JPB made a presentation of the Draft Caltrain Strategic Plan. The following comments were made by CMAQ members:

1. Have you considered forming a JPA just like BART to have tax collecting ability? The answer was no.
2. Does the Moderate Growth scenario presume continued Measure A support? The answer was yes.

3. The business communities are fixated with BART, and they always ask when is BART coming down the peninsula. But BART is too expensive. We need to present the benefits of Caltrain to the business community.
4. Baby Bullet is not blended in enough. Need to talk about the Baby Bullet, Grade Separation, and Electrification together.
5. When use the term “BART-like” service, one must be careful because Caltrain is better than BART in certain areas. You may want to clarify that it means 15 minutes headway or more quiet cars.
6. Planning for electrification and its costs need to be laid out more clearly. Tunnels won’t work in all communities, and there may not be sufficient right of way for electrification. Must consider the negative impacts on cities before moving ahead. There should to be a process for the cities and communities to get involved and work with Caltrain. That way, if a fence is proposed to be put up for access control, for example, we will make sure that the fence will not result in dividing the community. Electrification may not get the increased ridership projected. Commuters care more about frequency and reliability.
7. The presentation needs to be tailored to the audience. Not everyone understands the difference between Baby Bullet and Express Train.
8. A vision of “World class system” would scare away voters. We may just need a system that works.

Motion: to support the continuation of active planning and to be in a state of readiness when money is available. *Bigelow/Stein*. In addition, Member *Lempert* moved to recommend the continuation of electrification study. All were in favor except Member *O’Connell* who was concerned about the potential of taking away homes and right of way due to electrification.

Motion: not to support the No Build scenario because we want improvement and need to move to the next level. *Davis/O’Connell, unanimous*.

Public comment: You are focusing on the nine county Bay Area and failed to recognize the larger region of the 20 counties serviced by rail including those serviced by the Altamont Corridor Express (ACE) and Capital Corridor train. BART is a very minor player in the larger system.

4. Approval of projects for the 2004/05 TFCA Program.

- Walter Martone presented the proposed 2004/05 TFCA program.
- The staff recommendations are to continue the C/CAG policies that have been in place for the past six years. This means that the funding will be devoted to the operation of employer-based shuttle services and the continuation of the Countywide Transportation Demand Management Program operated by the Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief

Alliance.

- The only major change in the program from last year deals with the funding for the Alliance. Last year there was a windfall in funding due to carryover funds and the transfer of the Regional Rideshare Program expense to the STIP. This windfall allowed C/CAG to fully fund the Alliance with TFCA funds instead of splitting the funding between the TFCA and the Congestion Relief Plan. Now that the windfall has been used up, it will be necessary to return to the split funding arrangement for the Alliance.

Motion: to recommend approval of the 2004/05 TFCA Program as recommended by staff. Bigelow/O'Connell, unanimous.

5. Update on Measure A Reauthorization.

- Geoff Kline reported on the Measure A TAC (comprised of all Directors of Public Works and Planning Directors) recommendations. The percentage share of each program is: 30% Highway/Roadway, 30% Transit, 20% Local Transportation, 15% Grade Separation, 3% Bike/Pedestrian, 1% TDM, 1% Admin. Of the 30% proposed share for the Highway/Roadway Program which amounts to \$360 million, about \$260 million will be committed to the top priority projects to be matched by STIP funds, and \$100 million will be set aside and be made available for emerging projects. Top priority projects are recommended primarily based on congestion and geographical equity. Emerging projects will be programmed on a 5-year cycle.
- Rich Napier stated that this will be one of the items be discussed at the C/CAG Retreat on February 5, 2004. All CMAQ members are invited to attend.
- As to those projects on the current Measure that will not get done, some will be carried over to the next Measure while others will be dropped, due to priority changes.

6 2004 Calendar of CMAQ meetings.

Approved.

Other Business:

Member Pierce announced that the City of Redwood City has a Land Use Development committee meeting every Wednesday at 6 to 8pm. Feel free to attend if interested.

7 Adjournment.

At 4:32 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.